

Appl. No. 10/724,839
Docket No. P147
Amdt. dated July 22, 2009
Reply to Office Action mailed on April 22, 2009
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 34, 36 – 38, 40, 42, 47, 49 – 51, 53 and 55 – 63 were pending in this application. Claim 32 has been amended. Claims 1 – 31, 35 – 39, 41, 43 – 46, 48 – 52, 54 and 56 – 63 have been canceled. Claims 32 – 34, 40, 42, 47, 53 and 55 are now pending. It is believed these changes do not involve any introduction of new matter. Consequently, entry of these changes is believed to be in order and is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections

Claims 38 and 51 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claims, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 38 and 51 ultimately depend from Claim 32. Claim 32 has been amended to incorporate the language of claims 38 and 51. As claims 38 and 51 were indicated as being allowable, it is believed that Claim 32 and its dependents are now in form for allowance. Applicants respectfully request allowance of the claims.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Over Hayek

Claims 32 – 34, 36, 40, 42, 47, 49, 53 and 55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Hayek et al. (US Patent No. 5,958,898)(“Hayek”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In an effort to advance prosecution, however, Claim 32 has been amended as noted above. It is believed that the amendment to Claim 32 has rendered this rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103 Over Van Loo

Claims 32 – 34, 36, 37, 40, 42, 47, 49, 50, 53 and 55 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Van Loo et al. (US Patent No. 6,500,805)(“Van Loo”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection. In an effort to advance prosecution, however, Claim 32 has been amended as noted above. It is believed that the amendment to Claim 32 has rendered this rejection moot. Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection.

Appl. No. 10/724,839
Docket No. P147
Amdt. dated July 22, 2009
Reply to Office Action mailed on April 22, 2009
Customer No. 27752

Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the present application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, entry of the amendments presented herein, reconsideration of this application, and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By 

Sarah Ann Dressel
Registration No. 58,484
(513) 983-4371

Date: July 22, 2009
Customer No. 27752